



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/549,236	04/13/2000	KEVIN W. CARLEY	AND1P405	7816

29838 7590 10/08/2002

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY, LLP (ACCENTURE)
1400 PAGE MILL ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 94304

EXAMINER

MORGAN, ROBERT W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3626

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/549,236

Applicant(s)

CARLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Robert W. Morgan

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,267,155 to Buchanan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,551 to Edwards et al.

As per claim 1, Buchanan et al. teaches a computer-assisted document generation system including a relational database (2, Fig. 1) used to manage document templates as well as store, retrieve and manipulate data within the templates (see: column 5, lines 39-50). Buchanan et al. further teaches that the templates are created and selected by the user according to the type of report needed to accommodate a task (see: column 5, lines 13-17).

Buchanan et al. fails to teach an error and summary report for a data load comprising the steps of:

- (c) verifying that all records to be loaded match the data management template; and
- (e) compiling a report of records that match the data management template and records that do not match the data management template.

Edwards et al. teaches a network verification system including a comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between two lists of data items, a first list (160, Fig. 1) and a second list (170, Fig. 1), also indicating any data item in the first list (160, Fig. 1) which do not

Art Unit: 3626

have matching data item in the second list (170, Fig. 1) or vice versa and then records them in an error report (190, Fig. 1) (see: column 26, lines 38-56). The Examiner considers the step of comparing data to included verifying the matched and unmatched data before it is compiled to generated an error report.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the error report feature as taught by Edwards et al. within the computer-assisted document template system with a relational database as taught by Buchanan et al. with the motivation of detecting and preparing a summary report of matched and unmatched data in a database which better informs the user of any discrepancy involved with data being stored in the database.

As per claim 3, Buchanan et al. teaches the claimed records include medical records (see: column 7, lines 37-45 and Fig. 1).

As per claim 5, Buchanan et al. teaches the step of loading the records into a table before validation of the records. This feature is met by the relational database comprising a series of data structure linked through common fields. Additionally, Buchanan et al. also teach that the data structures are presented to user in collection of tables (see: column 5, lines 42-47).

Claim 7 differs from method claim 1 by reciting a “computer program embodied on a computer readable medium...” in the preamble and the recitation of code segments in the body of the claim. As per this limitation, Buchanan teaches a computer-assisted system that includes an electronic display (14, Fig. 1), data-processing device (16, Fig. 1) and electronic storage device (20, Fig. 1) used for storing information within a relational database (2, Fig. 1) (see: column 4, lines 14-26). The remainder of claim 7 repeats the limitations of claim 1, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 1.

As per claims 9 and 11, they are rejected for the same reason set forth in claims 3 and 5, respectively.

Claim 13 differs from method claim 1 by reciting a “system for generating...” in the preamble and the recitation of logic in the body of the claim. As per this limitation, Buchanan et al. teaches a document generation system using relational database that are implemented using a B-tree model and the database manipulation is performed through program calls to executable functions provided by a program (see: column 5, lines 52-57). The remainder of claim 13 repeats the limitations of claim 1, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 1.

As per claims 15 and 17, they are rejected for the same reason set forth in claims 3 and 5, respectively.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,267,155 to Buchanan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,551 to Edwards et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,469,576 to Dauerer et al.

As per claim 2, Buchanan et al and Edwards et al. teaches the claimed steps of separating records that match the data management template from records that do not match the data management template. This limitation is met by the comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between all compared data as well as generating reports that include records of the matched and unmatched data (see: Edwards: column 26, lines 38-56).

Buchanan et al. and Edwards et al. fail to teach the claimed sending the records to a user station if there are records that do not match the data management template.

Art Unit: 3626

Dauerer et al. teaches a data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: column 14, lines 20-26).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include transmitting of reports including mismatch data with the system as by Buchanan et al. and Edwards et al. with motivation of providing the user with several error reports to ensure that inaccurate information is not being loading into the database.

As per claim 4, Buchanan et al. and Edwards et al. fail to teach the claimed no records are sent to the database if any of the records do not match the data management template.

Since Dauerer et al. teaches denying access to the system once the detection of invalid or duplicate authorization occurs (see: column 4, lines 47-59). The Examiner considers denying of access once invalid or duplicate authorization occurs to include record invalidation that basically interrupts any further transmission of the records associated with the invalid or mismatched information and prevents the storing of the record into database.

The motivation for combining the teachings of Dauerer et al. with the system of Buchanan et al. and Edwards et al. are discussed above in the rejection of claim 2, and incorporated herein.

As per claim 6, Buchanan et al. and Edwards et al. fail to teach the claimed step of sending a notification upon detecting a concurrently executing load process.

Dauerer et al. teaches a data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: column 14, lines 20-26). The

Art Unit: 3626

Examiner considers the transmission of reports to a remote user as notification to the user of the data that is matched and mismatched as well as the data that is entered and not entered into database.

The motivation for combining the teachings of Dauerer et al. with the system of Buchanan et al. and Edwards et al. are discussed above in the rejection of claim 2, and incorporated herein.

As per claims 8, 10 and 12, they are rejected for the same reason set forth in claims 2, 4 and 6, respectively.

As per claims 14, 16 and 18, they are rejected for the same reason set forth in claims 2, 4 and 6, respectively.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

In related art (6,209,004) Taylor discloses method and system using a processor, video display and relational database to format, define, generate, maintain, distribute and analyze sets of related documents.

In related art (5,799,073) Fleischer, III et al. teaches an intelligent network application for collecting and recording data including an error or exception report.

In related art (6,434,628) Bowman-Amuah provides a system, method and article of manufacture for creating a common interface for exception handling.

Art Unit: 3626


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert W. Morgan whose telephone number is 703-605-4441.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 703-305-9588. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

RWM
rwm
September 30, 2002


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

